

EA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/804,368	03/12/2001	Yoshihito Ishibashi	09792909-4857	9043

26263 7590 07/18/2005

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
 P.O. BOX 061080
 WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER
 CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080

EXAMINER

ALVAREZ, RAQUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/804,368

Applicant(s)

ISHIBASHI, YOSHIHITO

Examiner

Raquel Alvarez

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 5/12/2005.
2. Claims 1-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gruse et al. (6,389,538 hereinafter Gruse).

With respect to claims 1-2, 11-12, 21, Gruse discloses a content usage-fee management system for performing transaction processing of content which is usable by a user device (col. 11, lines 49-64; col. 13, lines 5-9, Figure 6), said content usage fee management system comprising a service provider for managing a service for the provision of the content, wherein said service provider receives a usage log from said user device, said usage log being created by said user device and including log information containing data of a content usage fee (col. 47, lines 49-55; col. 13, line 45 to col. 14, lines 1-9), and said service provider compares the content usage fee with a predetermined threshold value as to determine the use of the content that is allowed (col. 23, lines 19-38).

With respect to claims 3, 5, 13 and 15, Gruse further teaches said service provider requests a clearing center which manages an electronic money balance of said user device to inquire about the electronic money balance usable by said user device (col. 48, lines 1-43; col. 49, lines 31-31).

With respect to claims 4 and 14, Gruse further teaches that the content is sent to a user device in the form of a secure container including the content encrypted with a content key, and said service provider sends the content key to said user device only when it is determined that the use of the content is allowed by comparing the content usage fee contained in said usage log with the predetermined threshold value (col. 9, lines 58-67; col. 10, lines 4-17; col. 12, lines 43-54; col. 15, lines 30-35; col. 16, lines 42-55; col. 17, lines 12-20).

With respect to claims 6, 16, Gruse further teaches wherein said service provider creates a receive log including the usage fee data based on said usage log received from said user device, and sends said receive log to a clearing center which manages an electronic money balance (col. 47, lines 49-67; col. 48, lines 1-43).

With respect to claims 7 and 17, Gruse further teaches that the threshold data is checked when said usage log is created, and, when the usage fee is found to exceed the threshold data, said user device adds identification data indicating that the usage

Art Unit: 3622

fee exceeds the threshold data to said usage log (col. 47, lines 49-55; col. 13, lines 45 to col. 14, line 9; col. 21, lines 46-51; col. 23, lines 19-38).

Claim 8 is rejected under same rationale as claims 6 and 16 rejected above.

Claim 18 is rejected under similar rationale as claims 6 and 16.

With respect to claims 9-10, 19-20, that the usage log is sent from the user device to said service provider, mutual authentication processing is performed between said user device and said service provider, and said user device attaches a digital signature to said usage log, and upon receiving said usage log, said service provider verifies the integrity of the digital signature (col. 9, lines 58-67; col. 10, lines 4-17; col. 12, lines 43-54; col. 15, lines 30-35; col. 16, lines 42-55; col. 17, lines 12-20).

Response to Arguments

4. The drawings received on 5/12/2005, do not contain any red markings showing proposed changes thereto.

5. The objection to the specification and to the claims have been withdrawn.

6. The 101 rejection has been withdrawn.

7. With respect to managing a service provider for managing a service for the provision of the content comprising receiving means for receiving a usage log from the user device, the usage log being created by the user device and including log information containing data of a content usage fee and determining means for determining whether the use of the content is allowed by comparing the content usage

Art Unit: 3622

fee with a predetermined threshold value. Applicant admits on page 2, last paragraph and the beginning of page 3 of the response to arguments that in Gruse the clearinghouses 105 perform the above mentioned function of the claims but argues that in the claims, a service provider is the one performing those functions. The Examiner wants to point out that in Gruse, the clearinghouses 105 is equivalent to the service provider of the claims because clearinghouses 105 is performing the same functions as the service provider of claimed invention.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Point of contact


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric w. Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

On July 15, 2005, the Central FAX Number will change to **571-273-8300**.

This new Central FAX Number is the result of relocating the Central FAX server to the Office's Alexandria, Virginia campus.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Raquel Alvarez
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

R.A.
7/11/2005